

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Claims**

Claim 1 was pending at the time of the Office Action. Claim 1 was objected to because the term “information content” on line 9 has already been defined and should be replaced with --the information content--, as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In this response, Applicant has amended claim 1 and added new claims 2-22 to focus on a specific embodiment related to claim 1. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification, for example on pages 15-22 and 80-92, and therefore no new matter is added.

### **II. Response to Objection of Claim 1**

Applicant has amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner to replace “information content” with “the information content.”

### **III. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,055,229 (Dorenbosch). To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every limitation of the claim. Applicant submits that Dorenbosch does not teach the following limitations recited in claim 1:

- determining an efficiency with which the client device can process the information content when the information content is stored in the first data format versus when the information content is stored in a second data format;

- determining the transmission capabilities of a wireless communication link used to send the information content to the client device; and

- determining a pre-set transformation mode associated with the wireless communication link;

- based on the efficiency with which the client device can process the information content in the first and second data formats, the transmission capabilities of the wireless communication link, and the pre-set transformation mode associated with the wireless communication link, determining whether to transform the information content at the server from the first data format to the second data format

Dorenbosch teaches a device that calculates a maximum amount of data that can be sent via a wireless link within a predetermined time to a user. The device then determines from a

predetermined set of user-presentation formats, a user-presentation format that requires less than the maximum amount of data. The device then formats the data in accordance with the user-presentation format before transmitting the data to the user. (Abstract). Dorenbosch pertains to a situation where there is a maximum time for delivery and is concerned with finding a possible data format that can transmit data in less than the maximum time.

Dorenbosch does not teach “determining a pre-set transformation mode associated with the wireless communication link,” as in claim 1. Rather, Dorenbosch teaches to format data based on a user selected presentation format. Further, the user selected presentation format is not associated with any particular wireless link. Because Dorenbosch does not teach all limitations of claim 1, Dorenbosch does not anticipate claims 1-10.

### *New Claims*

Regarding new claims 11-16, Applicant submits that Dorenbosch does not teach the following limitations recited in independent claim 11:

- based on the transmission capabilities, determining whether to send the information content to the client device using a proxy server mode or a proxyless mode;
- detecting that the transmission capabilities of the wireless communication link have changed; and
- switching between sending the information content to the client device using the proxy server mode or the proxyless mode.

Dorenbosch does not discuss sending data using a proxy server mode or a proxyless mode, and additionally, Dorenbosch also does not discuss switching between the modes for data transmission.

Regarding new claims 17-21, Applicant submits that Dorenbosch does not teach:

- based on (i) the efficiency with which the client device can process the information content when stored in the first data format and the second data format, (ii) the efficiency with which the server can process the information content when stored in the first data format and the second data format, and (iii) the transmission capabilities of the wireless communication link used to send the information content from the server to the client device, determining whether to send the information content from the server to the client device in the first data format or the second data format.

Dorenbosch does not discuss determining both the efficiency with which the device (client) and the server (network) can process the information content, and making a decision of how to send the content based on the determined efficiencies.

Regarding new claim 22, Applicant submits that Dorenbosch does not teach

determining a capability of the client device to display information content using a desktop layout and a handheld layout, wherein both the desktop layout and the handheld layout use a first data format, and wherein using the first data format the desktop layout requires more data content than the handheld layout;

...

based on (i) the capabilities of the client device to display the information content using the desktop layout and (ii) the transmission capabilities of the wireless communication link used to send the information content to the client device, determining whether to send the information content to the client device with data for supporting the desktop layout and the handheld layout or with less data for supporting only the handheld layout.

Dorenbosch does not teach determining the capability of the client device to display information in a desktop layout and a handheld layout, and also does not teach determining whether to send additional content to the client to support both the desktop and handheld layouts.

Because Dorenbosch does not teach all limitations of any of the new independent claims 11, 17 and 22, Dorenbosch does not anticipate new claims 11-22.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not taught by the cited art. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. If Examiner believes that further dialog would expedite consideration of the application, Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative below at (312) 913-3331 if any questions arise or if he may be of assistance to the Examiner.

**McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert and Berghoff LLP**  
Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 10, 2008

By: /Joseph A. Herndon/  
Joseph A. Herndon  
Reg. No. 50,469